

COMMITTEE ON LEGISLATIVE RESEARCH  
OVERSIGHT DIVISION

**FISCAL NOTE**

L.R. NO.: 0477-01  
BILL NO.: HB 73  
SUBJECT: Construction and Building Codes; Public Buildings  
TYPE: Original  
DATE: February 5, 2001

---

**FISCAL SUMMARY**

<b>ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON STATE FUNDS</b>			
<b>FUND AFFECTED</b>	<b>FY 2002</b>	<b>FY 2003</b>	<b>FY 2004</b>
General Revenue	(\$173,000 to Unknown)	(\$208,750 to Unknown)	(\$212,613 to Unknown)
Parks Sales Tax Fund	(\$18,750)	(\$56,250)	(Unknown)
Conservation Commission Fund	(Unknown)	(Unknown)	(Unknown)
<b>Total Estimated Net Effect on <u>All</u> State Funds</b>	<b>(\$191,750 to Unknown)</b>	<b>(\$265,000 to Unknown)</b>	<b>(\$212,613 to Unknown)</b>

<b>ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON FEDERAL FUNDS</b>			
<b>FUND AFFECTED</b>	<b>FY 2002</b>	<b>FY 2003</b>	<b>FY 2004</b>
<b>Total Estimated Net Effect on <u>All</u> Federal Funds</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>

<b>ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON LOCAL FUNDS</b>			
<b>FUND AFFECTED</b>	<b>FY 2002</b>	<b>FY 2003</b>	<b>FY 2004</b>
<b>Local Government</b>	<b>(Unknown)</b>	<b>(Unknown)</b>	<b>(Unknown)</b>

Numbers within parentheses: ( ) indicate costs or losses

This fiscal note contains 5 pages.

---

**FISCAL ANALYSIS**

---

**ASSUMPTION**

Officials from the **Office of Administration - Division of Facilities Management** and the **Department of Transportation** assume the proposed legislation would have no fiscal impact on their agencies.

Officials from the **City of Kansas City** assume the proposed legislation would have no fiscal impact on their city.

Officials from the **City of Springfield** assume the proposed legislation would have minimal fiscal impact, if any at all, as it appears to them that this would be a requirement enforced by the State, not the local municipality.

Officials from the **Office of Administration - Division of Design and Construction** assume this proposal would cost the state approximately \$125,000 in FY 02, \$128,750 in FY 03 and \$132,613 in FY 04. Based on a review of the Governor's Recommended Capital Improvement Plan for FY 00 - FY 01, 20 projects would have potential impact. The estimated cost per restroom (ADA compliant) is \$12,500. Assuming the FY 00 - 01 sampling represents an average capital cycle, 10 projects can be expected annually with a cost of \$12,500 each, giving an average unescalated cost of \$125,000.

Officials from the **Department of Natural Resources (DNR)** assume that over the next ten years, the requirement of a family restroom as proposed in this legislation would impact about 57 facilities in the state park system. These include the showerhouses, bathhouses and restrooms located throughout the system that presently contain three or more toilets. It should be noted that the existing restrooms in park facilities include showerhouses.

The fiscal impact is difficult to project, as each renovation would be different. However, if a family restroom were built as a new addition to an existing structure the cost would be approximately:

47 bathhouses / showerhouses @ \$18,750 each	= \$881,250
12 Visitor centers @ \$11,250 each	= \$135,000
7 Park lodges / Motels @ \$11,250	= \$ 78,750
_____ 10 Beach bathhouses @ \$18,000 each	= <u>\$180,000</u>
	\$1,275,000
OA Administrative Cost	= <u>\$191,250</u>
TOTAL COST IMPACT	\$1,466,250

**ASSUMPTION** (continued)

The DNR noted as stated previously, the cost estimate for the bathhouses/showerhouses assumes each would also contain a shower, which is consistent with the existing bathhouses and showerhouses, while the restrooms would contain a sink and toilet. The Department assumes these capital improvements would take place as CI funds in the Parks Sales Tax were available and upon appropriation.

**Oversight** notes that the Governor's Recommended Capital Improvement Plan for FY 02 and FY 03 identifies four (4) showerhouse projects for the DNR over the next two years. For FY 02, the plan identifies one (1) showerhouse addition; therefore, Oversight has reflected costs of \$18,750 (1 X \$18,750). For FY 03, the plan identifies two (2) showerhouse additions and one (1) showerhouse renovation; therefore, Oversight has reflected costs of \$56,250 (3 X \$18,750). For FY 04, Oversight has reflected unknown costs to the Park Sales Tax Fund as the costs are indeterminable.

Officials from the **Department of Conservation** (MDC) assume this proposal would result in fiscal impact on MDC funds because of its effect on new construction; however, the extent of fiscal impact is unknown.

Officials from **Southwest Missouri State University** assume that since no applicable facilities are programmed in the near future, this bill would have no immediate fiscal impact on the university.

Officials from **Truman State University** assume this proposal could cost \$48,000 in FY 02, \$80,000 in FY 03, \$80,000 in FY 04 and \$80,000 in FY 05 based on construction projects planned for the next four fiscal years. Officials also noted that there would be increased operating costs (custodial, etc) which they are unable to estimate.

Officials from the **University of Missouri** estimate this proposed legislation would cost the University approximately \$3.5 million in the next ten years.

Officials from the **City of St. Louis, St. Louis County** and **Jackson County** did not respond to our fiscal note request. Oversight assumes that each of these entities would incur costs over the next three fiscal years in renovating or constructing new public buildings and therefore would be required to install unisex restrooms; however, the fiscal impact is not readily determinable. Therefore, Oversight is showing local government costs as (Unknown).

FISCAL IMPACT - State Government

FY 2002	FY 2003	FY 2004
(6 Mo.)		

**GENERAL REVENUE**

<u>Cost - Office of Administration</u>	<u>(\$125,000)</u>	<u>(\$128,750)</u>	<u>(\$132,613)</u>
<u>Cost - Truman State University</u>	<u>(\$48,000)</u>	<u>(\$80,000)</u>	<u>(\$80,000)</u>
<u>Cost - University of Missouri</u>	<u>(Unknown)</u>	<u>(Unknown)</u>	<u>(Unknown)</u>
<u>Cost - Other State Colleges &amp; Universities</u>	<u>(Unknown)</u>	<u>(Unknown)</u>	<u>(Unknown)</u>
<b>Estimated Net Effect on GENERAL REVENUE FUND</b>	<b><u>(\$173,000 to Unknown)</u></b>	<b><u>(\$208,750 to Unknown)</u></b>	<b><u>(\$212,613 to Unknown)</u></b>

#### **PARKS SALES TAX FUND**

<u>Cost - Construction of unisex restrooms</u>	<u>(\$18,750)</u>	<u>(\$56,250)</u>	<u>(Unknown)</u>
--	-------------------	-------------------	------------------

#### **CONSERVATION COMMISSION FUND**

<u>Cost - Construction of unisex restrooms</u>	<u>(Unknown)</u>	<u>(Unknown)</u>	<u>(Unknown)</u>
--	------------------	------------------	------------------

<u>FISCAL IMPACT - Local Government</u>	FY 2002 (6 Mo.)	FY 2003	FY 2004
---	--------------------	---------	---------

<u>Costs - Political Subdivisions</u>	<u>(Unknown)</u>	<u>(Unknown)</u>	<u>(Unknown)</u>
---------------------------------------	------------------	------------------	------------------

#### FISCAL IMPACT - Small Business

Small businesses that have public restrooms as specified in this proposed legislation would be required to comply with the provisions of this proposal and therefore, would have some fiscal impact.

#### DESCRIPTION

This proposal requires public facilities such as sports stadiums, auditoriums, and shopping malls which are built after January 1, 2002, to provide one family restroom for every pair of male and

L.R. NO. 0477-01  
BILL NO. HB 73  
PAGE 5 OF 5  
February 5, 2001

female restrooms which have three or more toilets. Family restrooms are required to have a privacy latch and comply with all state and federal laws regarding access for persons with disabilities.

This proposal also requires a privacy latch for entrances to restrooms which have no more than two toilets. Such restrooms are required to comply with all state and federal laws regarding access for persons with disabilities.

Facilities constructed prior to January 1, 2002, which undergo a major structural renovation are required to provide family restrooms or privacy latches for restroom entrances.

This legislation is not federally mandated, would not duplicate any other program and would not require additional capital improvements or rental space.

#### SOURCES OF INFORMATION

City of Kansas City  
City of Springfield  
Office of Administration - Division of Facilities Management  
Office of Administration - Division of Design and Construction  
Department of Natural Resources  
Department of Conservation  
Department of Transportation  
Southwest Missouri State University  
Truman State University  
University of Missouri

**NOT RESPONDING: Southeast Missouri State University, City of St. Louis, St. Louis County, Jackson County Executive**



Jeanne Jarrett, CPA  
Director

February 5, 2001